# Organic Womanism v3

## First is the framing

#### First, Feminist epistemology is critical to challenging the sexist and androcentric control over knowledge
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Feminist epistemology is about the ways gender influences what we take to be knowledge. Consider impersonal theoretical and scientific knowledge, the kind of knowledge privileged in the academy. Western societies have labeled this kind of knowledge "masculine" and prevented [[womxn]] from acquiring and producing it, often on the pretext that it would divert their vital energies from their "natural" reproductive labor (Hubbard1990; Schiebinger 1989). Theoretical knowledge is also often tailored to the needs of **mostly male managers, bureaucrats, and officials exercising power in their role-given capacities** (H. Rose 1987; Smith 1974; Collins **1990Feminist epistemologists** claim that the ways gender categories have been used to understand the character and status of theoretical knowledge, whether men or [womxn] have produced and applied this knowledge, and whose interests it has served have often had a detrimental impact on its content. For instance, feminist epistemologists suggest that various kinds of practical know-how and personal knowledge (knowledge that bears the marks of the knower's biography and identity), such as the kinds of un theoretical knowledge that mothers have of children, are undervalued when they are labeled "feminine." Given the androcentric need **to represent the "masculine" as independent of the "feminine,"** this labeling has led to a failure to use un theoretical knowledge effectively in theoretical reasoning (Smith 1974;H. Rose 1987). Traditional epistemology finds these claims of feminist epistemology to be highly disturbing, If not plainly absurd. Some feminist epistemologists in turn have rejected empiricism (Harding1986) or even traditional epistemology as a whole (Flax 1983) for its seeming inability to comprehend these claims. I argue, contrary to these views, that a naturalized empiricist epistemology offers excellent prospects for advancing a feminist epistemology of theoretical knowledge. The project of feminist epistemology with respect to theoretical knowledge has two primary aims (Longino 1993a). First, it endeavors to explain the achievements of feminist criticism of science, which is devoted to revealing sexism and androcentrism in theoretical inquiry. An adequate feminist epistemology must explain what it is for a scientific theory or practice to be sexist and androcentric, how these features are expressed in theoretical inquiry and in the application of theoretical knowledge, and what bearing these features have on evaluating research. Second, the project of feminist epistemology aims to defend feminist scientific practices, which incorporate commitment to the liberation of [womxn] and the social and political equality of all persons. An adequate feminist epistemology must explain how research projects with such moral and political commitments can produce knowledge that meets such epistemic standards as empirical adequacy and fruitfulness. I will argue that these aims can be satisfied by a branch of naturalized, social epistemology that retains commitments to a modest empiricism and to rational inquiry. Feminist naturalized epistemologists therefore demand no radical break from the fundamental internal commitments of empirical science. They may **propose changes in our conceptions of what these commitments amount** to, or changes in our methods of inquiry. But these can be derived from the core concept of reason, conjoined with perhaps surprising yet empirically supported hypotheses about social or psychological obstacles to achieving them, and the social and material arrangements required for enabling better research to be done. To see how such derivations are possible, modest conceptions of empiricism and reason must be explained before I outline a feminist epistemology that employs these notions.

#### Second, The role of the judge is to be a critical educator with doubt about dominant pedagogy. Pedagogy is never neutral. Every position either implicitly or actively promotes a positional mode of understanding. The only permissible educational model is one that challenges oppressive power structures.

Espinoza 03 Tejeda, Carlos, Manuel Espinoza, Kris Gutierrez. “Toward a decolonizing pedagogy: Social justice reconsidered.” In Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change (2003): 9-38

.Critical pedagogy has put forth the notion that **classroom practice integrates** particular curriculum content and design, **instructional strategies** and techniques, **and forms of evaluation.** It argues **that** these **specify** a particular version about **what knowledge is of most worth, what it means to know** something, **and how we might construct a representation of our world and** our **place within it** (McLaren 1998). From this perspective, **the pedagogical is inherently ideological political.** For us a decolonizing pedagogy encompasses both an anticolonial and decolonizing notion of pedagogy and an anticolonial and decolonizing pedagogical praxis. It is an anticolonial and decolonizing theory and praxis that insists that colonial domination and its **frameworks** operate and are reproduced in and through the curricular content and design, the instructional practices, the social organization of learning, and the forms of evaluation that inexorably **sort** and label **students into** enduring **categories of success and failure** of schooling. Thus, an **anticolonial** and decolonizing pedagogical **praxis** explicitly **wor[k] to transform** these dimensions of schooling so that **schools** become sites **for** the **development of** a **critical** decolonizing **consciousness** and activity **that work to ameliorate** and ultimately end **the** mutually constitutive forms of **violence that characterize our** internal neo**colonial condition.** For us, a decolonizing pedagogy addresses both the means and the ends of schooling.

Implications:

1. Means the ballot is key. Assessments of win or loss define a worldview that implicitly casts doubt or approval on epistemological methods.
2. Inclusion is a prior question. Before addressing material or philosophical issues, reconstructing our current forms of knowledge is necessary to create a space in which the oppressed actually matter.

#### Third, Challenging the historical conceptions of hierarchal epistemology is key to resist masculinist domination over women and nature

#### Fourth, Educational spaces present a unique opportunity for individuals to act against hegemonic norms – organic womanist pedagogy has the strongest link to actually being able to reconstruct our knowledge structures.
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What is ecofeminist pedagogy? We have no authorial and definitive answers, but we embrace ecofeminist pedagogy as a way to critique t mal-industrial-complex and interrupt the hegemonic discursive system that and sustains meat-eating. Ecofeminist pedagogy can be interpreted as a critical approach theoretical and practical orientation and approach for bringing political co and educational practices together. As Weil (1993) explains, "Ecofeminist pedagogy is a perspective which challenges the domination and hierarchical systems of opposition that underlie the patriarchal structures and philosophies of the dominant cu and a methodology which attempts to untangle and disarm patriarchal indoctrin as it relates to various aspects of our life-styles, beliefs, ideas, and behaviors" (31 This ecofeminist teaching philosophy assumes that pedagogy and politics cate each other within mutually reinforcing moments, and to critique and refig tablished social identities and representations (Giroux 1991, 1994, 1997 1994a; Said 1983). "**We should not forfeit the opportunity of theorizing both teachers and students as historical agents of resistance"** (McLaren 1994, 213). Teach agents of resistance by working to question and transform hegemonic power rel For instance, teachers can use tactical interruptions to disrupt the dominant discourse order. An "interruption provides a gap in the narrative in which vegetarianism c entertained" (Adams, 1990, 137), "the gestalt shift by which vegetarianism heard" (136), and "destabilizes the text and the culture it represents" (139). These dissonant ruptures between meanings, values, and identities that simultane oppress and resist that students can cultivate a critical-relational c

#### Thus the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best takes steps to integrate ecofeminist pedagogy

#### Fifth, Organic womanism is a branch of ecofeminism, which allows an analysis with an intersection of race, class, and gender – epistemological starting point of the aff is necessary to resolve all other impacts. Nuclear production in the context of organic womanism is intrinsically tied to a connection with nature.

Nalunnakkal 03 (The Rev. Dr. George Matthew Nalunnakkal, December 1, 2003, “Towards an Organic Womanism: New Contours of Ecofeminism in India”, Journal of Ethics)

Vandana Shiva is uncritical in her use of Brahminic Hindu symbols (especially problematic when such symbols are heavily used by the evangelists of "Cultural Nationalism' in India) and also quite insensitive to the Dalit (caste) dimensions of environmental concerns. However, there are others such as Aruna Gnanadason, Gabriele Dietrich and Elizabeth Joy, who seek to look at ecological issues from the vantage point of Dalit and Adivasi women.18 Any attempt to grapple with the issues of women and nature sans a focus on the caste and tribal interplay in India will be of little relevance. Towards an Organic Womanism Naming women… [19] One of the academic challenges for feminism in India, it appears, is that of expounding an organic womanist perspective as against a Western, middle class and at times elitist brand of ecofeminism, a perspective which would address the issues of women and nature, particularly from a Dalit/tribal perspective, not merely from a perspective of women in an unqualified sense. Imagined and presented as a homogenous and monovocal category, 'women' in eco-feminism remains by and large an un-problematized construct. Organic womanism, on the other hand, particularizes 'women' -it is the Dalit and Adivasi women interacting with land (ecology) that constitutes the core of organic womanism. The term 'organic womanism' is used here in preference to 'ecofeminism'. 'Womanism' is a category that has been popularized by African feminists. Pointing out the limitations of ecofeminism vis-a-vis its largely middle class orientation, and its inability to address the specific issues of the interlocking of race and gender, African feminists have coined the term 'womanism' as an alternative vision to ecofeminism. In the Indian context, which is also characterized by the phenomenon of casteism, womanism makes much more sense to women of Dalit and Adivasi locale. One of the arguments in favor of ecofeminism, though, is that it provides a much more inclusive framework, as it does not necessarily exclude men from interacting and co-operating with the project of feminism. Womanism, in this sense, need not be seen as an exclusive enterprise of women alone. At the same time, it will also be interested in retaining a certain sense of 'methodological exclusivism', which is required for an identity politics oriented discourse such as organic womanism. The adjective 'organic' is engaged here to highlight the natural relationship that Dalit and tribal women have with nature, which women of middle class and other sections of society do not possess at the same level and intensity. 21] Given that in India the ownership of women's body and sexuality, and that of land (ecology) has its base in the power relations that are primarily rooted in caste and ethnic structures, this perspective is of immense significance. In the caste-ridden Indian society, bodies of Dalits and tribal women continue to be the 'property' of upper caste men. As Elizabeth Joy expresses the plight of Dalit women: The Dalit women who work in the field constantly face the threat of rape…the bodies of Dalit women are the most exploited and abused. No other sections of women face this situation as Dalit women do.19 [22] Even today, in many parts of the country, Dalit women are raped and sexually abused by their feudal and upper caste lords. They are forced to undergo this experience almost like a ritual. Such accounts of atrocious demeaning of Dalit bodies and sexuality find little space in the cerebral exercises of Shiva and Mies. Moreover, it ought to be noted that in India, social division of labour (caste system) and sexual violence also plays a significant role in causing ecological crises.20 Shiva and Mies miss, almost entirely, this important cross- current of caste in the interplay of class and gender. While economic class reductionism is one of the major flaws in Marxist analysis, gender reductionism appears to be the real travesty in Shiva and Mies. According to them: We see the devastation of the earth and her beings by the corporate warriors, and the threat of nuclear annihilation by the military warriors as feminist concerns. It is the same masculinist mentality, which would deny us our right to own our bodies and our sexuality21 [23] The masculinist culprits here are identified as the corporate and military warriors, the global capitalist forces. However, the local protagonists, the 'upper caste' warriors and the system of casteism are let off in this scrutiny. The 'we' and the 'us' in Shiva and Mies represent women in general, not specifically women of Dalit and tribal locale.22 The particularity of the plight of Dalit and tribal women in India cannot but be emphasized because they bear the real brunt, and form the immediate victims of masculinist hegemony in India. In this regard, one needs to critically look at some of the traditional Indian (Brahminic Hindu) strands on women and sexuality. Sanskritic Hinduism goes to the extent of glorifying women and nature, even according them divine status, albeit in an 'orientalist' and esoteric sense. The patriarchal face of this tradition is unmistakably recognized in Narada Smriti, which has this to say about women: Women are created for offspring, a woman is the field and a man is the possessor of the field.23 It further adds: Like the earth, a woman too has to bear pain. The earth is ploughed, furrowed, dug into…a woman also is pierced and ploughed.24

#### Sixth, Organic womanism engages in a unique political praxis- redefines and engages in the political making it a prerequisite to all political framing

Nalunnakkal 2 (The Rev. Dr. George Matthew Nalunnakkal, December 1, 2003, “Towards an Organic Womanism: New Contours of Ecofeminism in India”, Journal of Ethics)

Organic Womanism: A New Political Praxis Organic womanism stands out also on account of its revolutionary political praxis. Whereas much of ecofeminism remains at the level of mere intellectual engagement, organic womanism asserts itself in the form of civil society movements through concrete socio-political action. In this sense, organic womanism actually takes the debate on women and ecology to a postmodern phase. It takes on the dimensions of 'micro-politics' or 'resistance politics'35, raising unsettling questions about capital (economic, cultural and symbolic), questions of ownership and control over resources. Power is understood vis-à-vis a 'multiplicity of relations, de-centred and produced incessantly from one movement to the another', as Foucault describes it. De-centred power warrants de-centralized politics. As Ashi Sara observes, the 'self-rule' concept of Adivasis, as it has been explicated by the Adivasi Gothra Maha Sabha (AGMS) in Kerala, corresponds to this postmodern/post-structuralist notion of democratic power.36 It is not a democracy imposed by the State, but a democracy where women represent themselves. From this perspective, organic womanism would care less about the political correctness of theory because the very power relations behind a theory are brought under close scrutiny here. As Quinby puts it, theory is applied here not in the prescriptive mode, rather in the interrogative mode, raising questions about leadership and power dynamics. No ideology enjoys a sacrosanct position in such politics, which affirms the provisional nature of all ideological points of reference. This will even challenge certain essentialist tendencies within ecofeminism. Organic womanism refuses to treat women as a monovocal subject, feminity as of pure essence, nature as a fixed locus, holism as a deterministic system, and body as a static materiality.37 Gayatri Spivak also warns us on the dangers of essentialism when she says: Essentialism is a trap…Homogenizing women's diverse experiences and then romanticizing that "essence" blind us to the myriad ways in which the idea of 'womanhood' is implicated in constraints on and brutality against women. 38

#### Thus the advocacy is that countries ought to prohibit the production of nuclear power through the lense of organic womanism.

## Next is the story line

### Part 1 the symbolic representations of nuclear power

#### Nuclear power personifies a male structure perpetuating forms of masculine domination

Caputi 04, Jane Goddesses and Monsters: Women, Myth, Power, and Popular Culture <https://books.google.com/books/about/Goddesses_and_Monsters.html?id=C_r6meksRjUC&printsec=frontcover&source=kp_read_button#v=onepage&q=nuclear&f=false> 2004

Feminist criticism has focused on exposing what Diana Russell (1989) calls “nuclear phallacies” (fig. 10.1). Carol Cohn (1987) critiques the pervasively pornographic imagery and language of nuclear strategists. Feminist theologian Mary Condren (1989, 20I) avers: “Nuclear destruction is intrinsic to the spirituality and theology generated by Western culture.” Monica Sjoo and Barbara Mor (1991, 316) concur: “We suggest that the atomic or nuclear blast is man’s final identification with the Sun God, the final annihilation of matter/mother-and that this is the ultimate goal of all patriarchal religion.” The scientific quest that led to the development of nuclear technology was characterized by intense desire to split the atom, to break what the Cherokee thinker Marilou Awiakta (1986) understands as the “mother heart of the universe.” For about two centuries, split, and implicitly violent term, has served in “low slang” as a synonym for “copulate…as in…’I’d like to split that one’” (Beale, 1989, 424). The environmental historian Caroline Merchant (1980) has traced the implicit sexual violence of the seventeenth century scientific revolution as revealed through its characteristic metaphors of “mastering”, “disrobing,” and “penetrating” nature, understood as a female form. All such sexually violent imagery historically has marked nuclear metaphor. Atomic scientists are figured as investigating “the most intimate properties of matter”, “penetrating hidden mysteries, “tearing away veils to reveal inner secrets, and laying bare the structure of atoms. One scientist told of his “satisfaction in smashing a resistant atom” (Weart, 1989, 58). Once that defiant atom was smashed and split, the resulting bomb at first was conceptualized as male. The original scientists working at Los Alamos took bets among themselves as to whether they would ultimately have a “boy” or a “girl”- that is, a success or a dud. A success it was: The bomb dropped on Hiroshima was called “Little Boy.” In 1945 the War Department historian-journalist William L. Laurence won much acclaim for his eyewitness accounts of the first bomb blasts, which double as descriptions of a pornographic “come shot”, glorying in the spectacle of male ejaculation: “The mushroom top was even more alive than the pillar, seething and boiling in a white fury of creamy foam, sizzling upward and then descending earthward, a thousand geysers rolled into one” (1946, 239). A canny awareness of the sexual and sexually violent dimensions of nuclear imagery and practice unforgettably informs Stanley Kubrick’s riotous 1963 film, *Dr. Strangelove Or, How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb*. General Jack D. Ripper, paranoid and sexually impotent, insists that he avoids sexual intercourse with women only because it results in a “loss of essence.” Ripper becomes obsessed with what he sees as a Soviet plot to pollute his “purity of essence” through fluoridation of water. He decides to wipe out the Soviet Union and orders airborne bombers to launch a nuclear attack, a move ultimately resulting in global apocalypse. General Ripper’s namesake, Jack the Ripper, did not rape his victims, but slit their throats and tore apart their breasts and genitals, actions that soon were understood as sexually motivated. Similarly, General Ripper avoids sexual intercourse, but substitutes a sexualized weapon-in his case, a nuclear bomb. The mutilated female corpse is the planet Earth. In 1948, when the United States was testing atomic weaponry on Bikini Atoll in the Pacific Ocean, the skimpy two-piece swimsuit was all the rage on the French Riviera. Popular jargon immediately joined the two phenomena. A long global history links the earth with the female body (Eliade, 1958a; Merchant, 1980). Such imagery is infused into cultural ideas about the Pacific Islands, which have long signified an erotic paradise to North Americans and Europeans, the original good place, the mother’s body (Porter, 1991, 104-5).

#### Nuclear power is the symbol of masculinity – a political artifact that rapes the earth and creates a monopolization of control over the notion of femininity. Maintaining production of the atom bomb replicates the hierarchal chain of command and oppressive power structures that follow from nuclear power

Grint and Gill 95 The Gender-technology Relation: Contemporary Theory and Research By Keith Grint, Rosalind Gill

nuclear technology is a useful example to illustrate some fundamental differences in approach to technology. Whereas a traditional approach might concede that the design and deployment of nuclear weapons has ‘political dimensions’, it would probably balk at assumptions that nuclear technology per se was inherently masculine and thus, for (some) women at least in need of replacement. Yet eco-feminism could point both to the immense power derived from nuclear sources and the prerequisite control over, and exploitation of nature, that this is implied. hence, what could be regarded as an inherently aggressive technology could not be harnessed for constructive purposes and must be interred and replaced by softer renewable green technologies such as wind and wave power. An alternative, but still essentialist, account nominates a particular form of political organization rather than masculinity, as the essential feature of nuclear power. thus winner argues that the atom bomb is an inherently political artifact. **as long as it exists, its lethal properties demand that it be controlled by a centralized, rigidly hierarchical chain of command.**

### Part 2 is the act and products of production

#### The production alone of weapons of mass destruction creates massive environmental destruction and violence that uniquely affects women.

Cohn and Ruddick ‘3 - \*founding director of the Consortium on Gender, Security and Human Rights and \*\* Winner of the Distinguished Woman Philosopher of the Year Award by the Society for Women in Philosophy and author of Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace (Carol and Sara, “A Feminist Ethical Perspective on Weapons of Mass Destruction,” Working Paper No. 104 Consortium on Gender, Security, and Human Rights, 2003, http://genderandsecurity.org/sites/default/files/carol\_cohn\_and\_sara\_ruddick\_working\_paper\_104.pdf) \*/KE \*we don’t endorse the ablest language in this evidence\*

Question Three asks whether it is ethical to develop and deploy WMD as deterrents only. That is, it asks the classic question of whether it is ethical to have weapons and threaten to use then, even if it is not ethical to use those weapons militarily. As the question is framed, then, “development” and “deployment” appear not as phenomena subject to ethical scrutiny unto themselves, but merely as way-stations, as adjuncts subsumed under what is taken to be the core ethical issue, which is seen as deterrence. 14 Carol Cohn and Sarah Ruddick Working Paper No. 104 This formulation does not work for us. We need to pause and recognize that there are really several questions enfolded in that one. We must not only ask about the ethical status of deterrence, but also whether its entailments – development and deployment – are themselves ethical. 27 One of the constitutive positions of anti-war feminism is that in thinking about weapons and wars, we must accord full weight to their daily effects on the lives of women. We then find that the development and deployment of nuclear weapons, even when they are not used in warfare, exacts immense economic costs that particularly affect women. In the words of a recent Indian feminist essay: “The social costs of nuclear weaponisation in a country where the basic needs of shelter, food and water, electricity, health and education have not been met are obvious.... [S]ince patriarchal family norms place the task of looking after the daily needs of the family mainly upon women, scarcity of resources always hits women the hardest. Less food for the family inevitably means an even smaller share for women and female children just as water shortages mean an increase in women’s labour who have to spend more time and energy in fetching water from distant places at odd hours of the day.” 28 While the US is not as poor a nation as India, Pakistan, or Russia, it has remained, throughout the nuclear age, a country in which poverty and hunger are rife, health care still unaffordable to many, low-cost housing unavailable, with crumbling public schools and infrastructure, all while the American nuclear weapons program has come at the cost of 4.5 trillion dollars.29 In addition to being economically costly, nuclear weapons development has medical and political costs. In the US program, many people have been exposed to high levels of radiation, including uranium miners; workers at reactors and processing facilities; the quarter of a million military personnel who took place in “atomic battlefield” exercises; “downwinders” from test sites; and Marshallese Islanders. 30 Politically, nuclear regimes require a level of secrecy and security measures that exclude the majority of citizens, and in most countries, all women, from defense policy and decision- making.” 31 From the perspective of women’s lives, we see not only the costs of the development of nuclear weapons, but also the spiritual, social and psychological costs of deployment. One cost, according to some feminists, is that “Nuclearisation produces social consent for increasing levels of violence. 32 Another cost, for many, is that nuclear weapons create high levels of tension, insecurity and fear. As Arundhati Roy puts it, nuclear weapons “[i]nform our dreams. They bury themselves like meat hooks deep in the base of our brains.” 33 Further, feminists are concerned about the effect of nuclear policy on moral thought, on ideas about gender, and how the two intersect. Nuclear development may legitimize male aggression, 15 Carol Cohn and Sarah Ruddick Working Paper No. 104 and breed the idea that nuclear explosions give a ‘virility’ to the nation which men as individuals can somehow also share. [T]he strange character of nuclear policy- making not only sidelines moral and ethical questions, but genders them. This elite gets to be represented as rational, scientific, modern, and of course masculine, while ethical questions, questions about the social and environmental costs are made to seem emotional, effeminate, regressive and not modern. This rather dangerous way of thinking, which suggests that questions about human life and welfare are somehow neither modern nor properly masculine questions, or that men have no capacity and concern for peace and morality, can have disastrous consequences for both men and women. 34 All in all, we find the daily costs of WMD development and deployment staggeringly high – in and of themselves sufficient to prevent deterrence from being an ethical moral option. A so-called “realist” response to this jud gement might well pay lip-service to the “moral niceties” it embodies, but then argue that deterrence is worth those costs. Or, perhaps to be more accurate, it might argue that the results of a nuclear attack would be so catastrophic that the rest of these considerations are really an irrelevant distraction; deterring a WMD attack on our homeland is the precondition on which political freedom and social life depend, and so it must be thought about in a class by itself. We make two rejoinders to this claim. First, we note that in the culture of nuclear defense intellectuals, even raising the issue of costs is delegitimized, in large part through its association with “the feminine.” It is the kind of thing that “hysterical housewives” do; something done by people not tough and hard enough to look harsh “reality” in the eye, unsentimentally; not strong enough to separate their feelings from theorizing mass death; people who don’t have “the stones for war.” Feminist analysis rejects the cultural division of meaning which devalues anything associated with women or femininity. It sees in that same cultural valuing of the so-called “masculine” over the so-called “feminine” an explanation of why it appears so self-evident to many that what is called “military necessity” should appropriately be prioritized over all other human necessities. And it questions the assumptions that bestow the mantle of “realism” on such a constrained focus on weapons and state power. Rather than simply being an “objective” reflection of political reality, we understand this thought system as 1) a partial and distorted picture of reality, and 2) a major contributor to creating the very circumstances it purports to describe and protect against. Second, just as feminists tend to be skeptical about the efficacy of violence, they might be equally skeptical about the efficacy of deterrence. Or, to put it another way, if war is a “lie,” so is deterrence. This is not, of course, to say that deterrence as a phenomena never occurs; no doubt one opponent is sometimes deterred from attacking another by the fear of retaliation. But rather deterrence as a theory, a discourse and set of practices underwritten by that discourse, is a fiction. 16 Carol Cohn and Sarah Ruddick Working Paper No. 104 Deterrence theory is an elaborate, abstract conceptual edifice, which posits a hypothetical relation between two different sets of weapons systems – or rather, between abstractions of two different sets of weapons systems, for in fact, as both common sense and military expertise tells us, human error and technological imperfection mean that one could not actually expect real weapons to function in the ways simply assumed in deterrence theory. Because deterrence theory sets in play the hypothetical representations of various weapons systems, rather than assessments of how they would actually perform or fail to perform in warfare, it can be nearly infinitely elaborated, in a never ending regression of intercontinental ballistic missile gaps and theater warfare gaps and tactical “mini- nuke” gaps, ad infinitum, thus legitimating both massive vertical proliferation and arms racing. Deterrence theory is also a fiction in that it depends upon “rational actors,” for whom what counts as “rational” is the same, independent of culture, history, or individual difference. It depends on those “rational actors” perfectly understanding the meaning of “signals” communicated by military actions, despite dependence on technologies that sometimes malfunction; despite cultural difference and the lack of communication that is part of being political enemies; despite the difficulties of ensuring mutual understanding even when best friends make direct face-to- face statements to each other. It depends on those same “rational actors” engaging in a very specific kind of calculus that includes one set of variables (e.g., weapons size, deliverability, survivability, as well as the “credibility” of their and their opponent’s threats), and excludes other variables (such as domestic political pressures, economics, or individual subjectivity). What is striking from a feminist perspective is that even while “realists” may worry that some opponents are so “insufficiently rational” as to be undeterrable, this does not lead them to search for a more reliable form of ensuring security, or an approach that is not so weapons-dependent. Cynthia Cockburn, in her study of women’s peace projects in conflict zones, describes one of the women’s activities as helping each other give up “dangerous day dreams.” 35 From a feminist anti-war perspective, having WMD as deterrents is a dangerous dream. The dream of perfect rationality and control which underwrites deterrence theory is a dangerous dream, since it legitimates constructing a system that only could be (relatively) safe if that perfect rationa lity and control were actually possible. Deterrence theory itself is a dangerous dream because it justifies producing and deploying WMD, thereby making their accidental or purposive use possible (and far more likely) than if they were not produced at all, nor deployed in such numbers. “Realists” are quick to point out the dangers of not having WMD for deterrence when other states have them. Feminist perspectives suggest that that danger only appears so self-evidently greater than the danger of having WMD if you discount as “soft” serious attention to the costs of development and deployment. 17 Carol Cohn and Sarah Ruddick Working Paper No. 104

#### Nuclear weapons are the ultimate assertion of men’s power over each other through phallic imagery and focus on domination

Cohn 87 – founding director of the Consortium on Gender, Security and Human Rights (Carol, “Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals”, Signs, Vol. 12, No. 4, Within and Without: Women, Gender, and Theory (Summer, 1987), pp. 687-718. JSTOR) \*/LEA

White men in ties discussing missile size Feminists have often suggested that an important aspect of the arms race is phallic worship, that "missile envy" is a significant motivating force in the nuclear build-up.12 I have always found this an uncomfortably reductionist explanation and hoped that my research at the Center would yield a more complex analysis. But still, I was curious about the extent to which I might find a sexual subtext in the defense professionals' discourse. I was not prepared for what I found. 692 I think I had naively imagined myself as a feminist spy in the house of death-that I would need to sneak around and eavesdrop on what men said in unguarded moments, using all my subtlety and cunning to unearth whatever sexual imagery might be underneath how they thought and spoke. I had naively believed that these men, at least in public, would appear to be aware of feminist critiques. If they had not changed their language, I thought that at least at some point in a long talk about "penetra- tion aids," someone would suddenly look up, slightly embarrassed to be caught in such blatant confirmation of feminist analyses of What's Going On Here.'3 Of course, I was wrong. There was no evidence that any feminist critiques had ever reached the ears, much less the minds, of these men. American military dependence on nuclear weapons was explained as "irresistible, because you get more bang for the buck." Another lecturer solemnly and scientifically announced "to disarm is to get rid of all your stuff." (This may, in turn, explain why they see serious talk of nuclear disarmament as perfectly resistable, not to mention foolish. If disarmament is emasculation, how could any real man even consider it?) A professor's explanation of why the MX missile is to be placed in the silos of the newest Minuteman missiles, instead of replacing the older, less accurate ones, was "because they're in the nicest hole-you're not going to take the nicest missile you have and put it in a crummy hole." Other lectures were filled with discussion of vertical erector launchers, thrust-to-weight ratios, soft lay downs, deep penetration, and the comparative advantages of pro- tracted versus spasm attacks-or what one military adviser to the National Security Council has called "releasing 70 to 80 percent of our megatonnage in one orgasmic whump."14 There was serious concern about the need to harden our missiles and the need to "face it, the Russians are a little harder than we are." Disbelieving glances would occasionally pass between me and my one ally in the summer progtam, another woman, but no one else seemed to notice. If the imagery is transparent, its significance may be less so. The temptation is to draw some conclusions about the defense intellectuals themselves-about what they are really talking about, or their motivations; but the temptation is worth resisting. Individual motivations cannot neces- sarily be read directly from imagery; the imagery itself does not originate in these particular individuals but in a broader cultural context. Sexual imagery has, of course, been a part of the world of warfare since long before nuclear weapons were even a gleam in a physicist's eye. The history of the atomic bomb project itself is rife with overt images of competitive male sexuality, as is the discourse of the early nuclear physi- cists, strategists, and SAC commanders.'5 Both the military itself and the arms manufacturers are constantly exploiting the phallic imagery and promise of sexual domination that their weapons so conveniently suggest. A quick glance at the publications that constitute some of the research sources for defense intellectuals makes the depth and pervasiveness of the imagery evident. Air Force Magazine's advertisements for new weapons, for example, rival Playboy as a catalog of men's sexual anxieties and fantasies. Consider the following, from the June 1985 issue: emblazoned in bold letters across the top of a two-page advertisement for the AV-8B Harrier II-"Speak Softly and Carry a Big Stick." The copy below boasts "an exceptional thrust to weight ratio" and "vectored thrust capability that makes the . .. unique rapid response possible." Then, just in case we've failed to get the mes- sage, the last line reminds us, "Just the sort of'Big Stick' Teddy Roosevelt had in mind way back in 1901. "16 An ad for the BKEP (BLU-106/B) reads: The Only Way to Solve Some Problems is to Dig Deep. THE BOMB, KINETIC ENERGY PENETRATOR "Will provide the tactical air commander with efficient power to deny or significantly delay enemy airfield operations." "Designed to maximize runway cratering by optimizing penetration dynamics and utilizing the most efficient warhead yet designed."17 (In case the symbolism of "cratering" seems far-fetched, I must point out that I am not the first to see it. The French use the Mururoa Atoll in the South Pacific for their nuclear tests and assign a woman's name to each of the craters they gouge out of the earth.) Another, truly extraordinary, source of phallic imagery is to be found in descriptions of nuclear blasts themselves. Here, for example, is one by journalist William Laurence, who was brought to Nagasaki by the Air Force to witness the bombing. "Then, just when it appeared as though the thing had settled down in to a state of permanence, there came shooting out of the top a giant mushroom that increased the size of the pillar to a total of 45,000 feet. The mushroom top was even more alive than the pillar, seething and boiling in a white fury of creamy foam, sizzling upward and then descending earthward, a thousand geysers rolled into one. It kept struggling in an elemental fury, like a creature in the act of breaking the bonds that held it down."'8 Given the degree to which it suffuses their world, that defense intellec- tuals themselves use a lot of sexual imagery does not seem especially surprising. Nor does it, by itself, constitute grounds for imputing motiva- tion. For me, the interesting issue is not so much the imagery's psychody- namic origins, as how it functions. How does it serve to make it possible for strategic planners and other defense intellectuals to do their macabre work? How does it function in their construction of a work world that feels tenable? Several stories illustrate the complexity. During the summer program, a group of us visited the New London Navy base where nuclear submarines are homeported and the General Dynamics Electric Boat boatyards where a new Trident submarine was being constructed. At one point during the trip we took a tour of a nuclear powered submarine. When we reached the part of the sub where the missiles are housed, the officer accompanying us turned with a grin and asked if we wanted to stick our hands through a hole to "pat the missile." Pat the missile? The image reappeared the next week, when a lecturer scornfully declared that the only real reason for deploying cruise and Pershing II missiles in Western Europe was "so that our allies can pat them." Some months later, another group of us went to be briefed at NORAD (the North American Aerospace Defense Command). On the way back, our plane went to refuel at Offut Air Force Base, the Strategic Air Command head- quarters near Omaha, Nebraska. When word leaked out that our landing would be delayed because the new B-1 bomber was in the area, the plane became charged with a tangible excitement that built as we flew in our holding pattern, people craning their necks to try to catch a glimpse of the B-1 in the skies, and climaxed as we touched down on the runway and hurtled past it. Later, when I returned to the Center I encountered a man who, unable to go on the trip, said to me enviously, "I hear you got to pat a B-I." What is all this "patting"? What are men doing when they "pat" these high-tech phalluses? Patting is an assertion of intimacy, sexual possession, affectionate domination. The thrill and pleasure of "patting the missile" is the proximity of all that phallic power, the possibility of vicariously appro- priating it as one's own. But if the predilection for patting phallic objects indicates something of the homoerotic excitement suggested by the language, it also has another side. For patting is not only an act of sexual intimacy. It is also what one does to babies, small children, the pet dog. One pats that which is small, cute, and harmless-not terrifyingly destructive. Pat it, and its lethality disappears. Much of the sexual imagery I heard was rife with the sort of ambiguity suggested by "patting the missiles." The imagery can be construed as a deadly serious display of the connections between masculine sexuality and the arms race. At the same time, it can also be heard as a way of minimizing the seriousness of militarist endeavors, of denying their deadly consequences. A former Pentagon target analyst, in telling me why he thought plans for "limited nuclear war" were ridiculous, said, "Look, you gotta understand that it's a pissing contest-you gotta expect them to use every- thing they've got." What does this image say? Most obviously, that this is all about competition for manhood, and thus there is tremendous danger. But at the same time, the image diminishes the contest and its outcomes, by representing it as an act of boyish mischief.

### Part 3 is the nuclear heuristic

#### Our nuclear epistemology has shifted to a point of orientalism shaped by the crude exploitation of non-western countries

Wittman 11 Wittman, Nora “The Scramble for Africa's Nuclear Resources” New African No.507 June 2011

THE CURRENT NUCLEAR POLLUTION in Japan and the reactions of politicians and governments throughout Europe, the USA and Asia, even in the eye of disaster, indicate that they will never stop using nuclear power for military means and domestic energy generation and supply.¶ [ILLUSTRATION OMITTED]¶ As Japan was battling to control pollution from its Fukushima nuclear plant, destroyed by the massive earthquake that hit the region on II March, French President Nicolas Sarkozy was firmly pronouncing that a withdrawal from nuclear energy was totally out of question for France and will not happen--80% of domestic energy in France comes from nuclear plants.¶ A few hours later, EU ministers deemed it sufficient to submit European nuclear power reactors to a so-called "stress test", and even then only on a voluntary basis. Apparently, the nuclear industry and their party allies throughout the political spectrum have been for a long time in a tight marriage that is far too beneficial for them to split.¶ Africa is currently the continent where nuclear power plants are least present. Only one such plant is present in South Africa, imposed by the apartheid regime in the 1970s. It is located in Koeberg, 30km north of Cape Town, yet surrounded by the city's ever-spreading suburbs, and was built by a French company. Like most nuclear power plants, it has experienced serious problems and its reactors have had to be shut down several times, especially since 2005.¶ Of course, the idea is not totally unconceivable that there could have been more severe incidents before, and that in apartheid times the white supremacist regime would not have made it a top priority to inform and protect the surrounding African people. In 2010, 91 members of staff were contaminated with Cobalt-58 dust in an incident that was said to be confined to the plant only.¶ In view of these facts and the recent developments, it should be clearer than ever that Africa must not follow the path to ultimate and lasting nuclear destruction that European, North American and Asian leaders seem to be determined to continue to take. Indeed, Africa may not only have the responsibility to save itself from this fate, but may also ultimately have the power to save the world from some of this otherwise pre-programmed nuclear disaster. How? By refusing to let its vast nuclear resources be exploited.¶ South Africa's only nuclear power plant, In Koeberg, 30km north of Cape Town, was imposed by the apartheid regime in the 70s¶ [ILLUSTRATION OMITTED]¶ The nuclear powers are increasingly experiencing and preparing for problems of supply with the necessary crude nuclear materials such as uranium and plutonium. Even though it is said that countries such as the USA, Russia and China have or rather had vast uranium resources themselves, all of these countries are now very eager to identify, secure and exploit mines for nuclear materials throughout Africa.¶ Africa, the continent endowed with the richest natural resources, has vast nuclear materials in its soil. Almost every African country is currently being mined or examined and prepared for nuclear exploitation.¶ According to a recent report updated in February 2011 by the World Information Service on Energy (WISE), an environmental activist amalgamation based in Amsterdam, China National Nuclear Group, being that country's biggest nuclear power plant builder, signed a deal with the China-Africa Development Fund, a Chinese state-run institution, in 2010 to examine and exploit uranium resources throughout Africa.¶ French, Canadian, British, Swiss, Japanese, Russian, Chinese, Australian and other companies are mining uranium, or have signed contracts to do so very soon with Algeria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, DRCongo, Gabon, Malawi, Mali, Chad, South Africa, Tanzania, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Zambia and other African countries. …

#### Nuclear industries permit the state to enter into a constant state of exception where it is able to legitimize and deploy threats as a means to militarily dominate and colonize other nations

Kuar 11 (Raminder, A ‘nuclear renaissance’, climate change andthe state of exception, THE AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF ANTHROPOLOGY Volume 22, Issue 2)

Although Giorgio Agamben’s (2005) work on the normalisation of exceptional state practice has been much cited, it would appear that Robert Jungk anticipated some of his main axioms. Jungk outlines how the extraordinary, as it pertains to the state’s possession of nuclear weapons and the development of atomic industries since the mid-1940s, became the ordinary (Jungk 1979: 58). When associated with nuclear weapons, the state operates under the guise of a paradigm of security which promises ‘peace’ in terms of a nuclear deterrence to other countries and also legiti-mates the excesses of state conduct whilst abrogating citizens’ rights in the name of ‘national security’. Jungk adds that, in fact, state authoritarianism applied to all nation-states with nuclear industries: ‘Nuclear power was first used to make weap-ons of total destruction for use against military enemies, but today it even imperils citizens in their own country, because there is no fundamental difference between atoms for peace and atoms for war’ (Jungk 1979: vii). The inevitable spread of tech-nological know-how through a range of international networks and the effects of the US’ ‘atoms for peace’ program in the 1950s led to a greater number of nations constructing institutions for civilian nuclear power, a development that was later realised to enable uranium enrichment for the manufacture of weapons .Because of the indeterminacy between atoms for peace and atoms for war, the nuclear industries began to play a key part in several nations’ security policies, both externally with reference to other states and also internally with reference to objec-tors and suspected anti-national contingents. Jungk notes ‘the important social role of nuclear energy in the decline of the constitutional state into the authoritarian nuclear state’ by focussing on a range of indicators, including a report published by the American National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice in 1977 which suggested that:in view of the ‘high vulnerability of technical civilization’, emergency legislation should be introduced making it possible temporarily to ignore constitutional safeguards without previous congressional debate or consultation with the Supreme Court.(1979: 135) The bio-techno-political mode of governance encapsulates subjects into its folds such that it becomes a ‘technical civilisation’—a civilisation that, although promis-ing favourable aspects of modernity to the populace and development for the coun-try, is also to be accompanied by several risks to human and environmental safety that propel states, including democracies further towards authoritarianism. ‘Big sci-ence’—that is, science that is centralised or at least circumscribed by the state—and the bureaucracies surrounding it play a critical part in the normalisation of the state of exception, and the exercise of even more power over their citizens. Jungk elaborates on the routinisation of nuclear state violence, epistemological, juridical and physical :Such measures will be justified, not as temporary measures made necessary by an exceptional emergency … but by the necessity of providing permanent protection for a perpetually endangered central source of energy that is regarded as indispensable. A nuclear industry means a permanent state of emergency justified by a permanent threat. (1979: 135)This permanent state of emergency with respect to anything nuclear applies to restrictions on citizens’ freedom, the surveillance and criminalisation of critics and campaigners, the justification of the mobilisation of thousands of police men and sometimes military to deal with peaceful demonstrators against nuclear power, and a hegemony on ‘truth-claims’ where the nuclear industries are held as the solution to growing power needs whilst advancing themselves as climate change envi-ronmentalists. In this way, power structures and lifestyles need not be altered where nuclear power becomes, ironically, a powerful mascot of ‘clean and green’ energy. In India, the capitalist modality of the nuclear state was exacerbated by the ratification of the Indo-US civilian nuclear agreement in 2008, a bilateral accord which enables those countries in the Nuclear Suppliers Group to provide mate-rial and technology for India’s civilian nuclear operations even though it is nota signatory to the Nuclear non-Proliferation Treaty. This has led to an expansionof the nuclear industries in the country where the limited indigenous resources of uranium could then be siphoned into the nuclear weapons industries. The imposition of the nuclear state hand-in-hand with multinational corporations in regions such as Koodankulam in Tamil Nadu (with the Russian nuclear com-pany, Atomstroyexport), Haripur in West Bengal (with the Russian company,Rosatom) or Jaitapur in Maharashtra (with the French company, Areva), without due consultation with residents around the proposed nuclear power plants, has prompted S. P. Udayakumar (2009) to recall an earlier history of colonization describing the contemporary scenario as an instance of ‘nucolonisation(nuclear + colonisation)’.The Indian nuclear state, with its especial mooring in central government, hasconducted environmental enquiries primarily for itself—and this so in only asummary fashion. In a context where the Ministry of Environment and Forestscan override the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report forthe first two nuclear reactors at Koodankulam in 2001, saying that the decisionwas first made in the 1980s before the EIA Notification Act (1994); or where theSupreme Court of India can dismiss a petition against the construction of thesereactors simply by saying: ‘There is no reason as to why this court should sit inappeal over the Governmental decision relating to a policy matter more so, whencrores of rupees having (sic) been invested’ (cited in Goyal 2002), then there is astrong basis upon which to consider the Indian state as a whole as a nuclearisedstate—that is, a state wherein matters relating to nuclear issues are given inordi-nate leeway across the board. The nuclear enclave consisting of scientists, bureau-crats and politicians, is both the exception to and the rule that underpins the rest of state practice. So even though we may be talking about a domain of distinct governmental practice and political technology as encapsulated by the notion of a nuclear state, it is evident that its influence spreads beyond the nuclear domain in a discourse of nuclearisation through state-related stratagems which have become increasingly authoritarian and defence-orientated since the late 1990s. In a nut-shell, discourses about the urgency of climate change, global warming, nuclear power and defence have converged in a draconian and oppressive manner that now parades itself as the necessary norm for the nation. Despite their particularities, machinations of the Indian nuclear state are also nota-ble elsewhere. Joseph Masco elaborates on the ‘national-security state’ in the USA(2006: 14). Tony Hall comments upon the ‘defence-dominated, well-cushioned(nuclear) industry’ in the United Kingdom (1996: 10). And on the recent issue of the construction of more nuclear power stations in Britain, David Ockwell observesthat a public hearing was only undertaken for ‘instrumental reasons (i.e. it was alegal requirement), as demonstrated by a public statement by then prime ministerTony Blair that the consultation ‘won’t affect the policy at all’ (2008: 264). These narratives are familiar across the board where a nuclear renaissance is apparent. But critics continue to dispute the hijacking of environmentalism by the state and argue that if climate change is the problem, then nuclear power is by no means a solution. Moreover, the half-life of radioactive waste cannot be brushed away in a misplacedvindication of the saying, ‘out of sight, out of mind’

## Underview

#### No matter the type, the nuclear energy market is ran by lobbyist and PR firms making government secrecy a fervent issue. Autocracy will prop up the market reintrenching a form of hierarchy and oppression.

Wasserman 16 (Harvey, <http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/07/29/ny-times-pushes-nukes-while-claiming-renewables-fail-to-fight-climate-change/> , 7-29)

The idea that nuclear power might fight climate change, and that environmentalists might support it, is a recent concoction, a disgraceful, desperate load of utility hype meant to defend the status quo. Fukushima, unsolved waste problems and the plummeting price of renewables have solidified the environmental community’s opposition to nuke power. These reactors are dirty and dangerous. They are not carbon-free and do emit huge quantities of heated water and steam into the ecosphere. The utility industry can’t get private liability insurance for them, and relies on the1957 Price-Anderson Act to protect them from liability in a major catastrophe. The industry continually complains about subsidies to renewable energy but never mentions this government protection program without which all reactors would close. 7. Not just nuke power but the entire centralized fossil/nuke-based grid system is now being undermined by the massive drops in the price of renewable energy, and massive rises in its efficiency and reliability. The critical missing link is battery technology. Because the sun and wind are intermittent, there needs to be energy storage to smooth out supply. Elon Musk‘s billion-dollar Tesla Gigafactory in Nevada and many other industrial ventures indicate major battery breakthroughs in storage is here today. 8. Porter’s NY Times piece correctly says that the massive amounts of cheap, clean renewables flooding the grid in Europe and parts of the U.S. are driving nuclear power plants into bankruptcy. At least a dozen reactor shut downs have been announced in the U.S. since 2012 and many more are on their way. In Japan 52 of the 54 reactors online before the Fukushima disaster are now closed. And, Germany has pledged to shut all its reactors by 2022. But Porter attacks this by complaining that those nukes were supplying base load power that must be otherwise—according to him—shored up with fossil burners. Here’s his key line: “Renewable sources are producing temporary power gluts from Australia to California, driving out other energy sources that are still necessary to maintain a stable supply of power.” But as all serious environmentalists understand, the choice has never been between nukes versus fossil fuels. It’s between centralized fossil/nukes versus decentralized renewables. Porter’s article never mentions the word “battery” or the term “rooftop solar.” But these are the two key parts in the green transition already very much in progress. So here is what the Times obviously can’t bring itself to say: “Cheap solar panels on rooftops are now making the grid obsolete.” The key bridging element of battery back-up capability is on its way. Meanwhile there is absolutely no need for nuclear power plants, which at any rate have long since become far too expensive to operate. Spending billions to prop up dying nuke reactors for “base load” generation is pure corporate theft at the public expense, both in straight financial terms and in the risk of running badly deteriorated reactors deep into the future until they inevitably melt down or blow up. Those billions instead should go to accelerating battery production and distribution, and making it easier, rather than harder, to gain energy independence using the wind and the sun. All this has serious real-world impacts. In Ohio, for example, a well-organized shift to wind and solar was derailed by the Koch-run legislature. Some $2 billion in wind-power investments and a $500 million solar farm were derailed. There are also serious legal barriers now in place to stop homeowners from putting solar shingles and panels on their rooftops. Meanwhile, FirstEnergy strong-armed the Ohio Public Utilities Commission into approving a huge bailout to keep the seriously deteriorated Davis-Besse nuke operating, even though it cannot compete and is losing huge sums of money. Federal regulators have since put that bailout on hold. Arizona and other Koch-owned legislatures have moved to tax solar panels, ban solar shingles and make it illegal to leave the grid without still paying tribute to the utilities who own it. Indeed, throughout the U.S. and much of the western world, corporate-owned governments are doing their best to slow the ability of people to use renewables to rid themselves of the corporate grid. For an environmental movement serious about saving the Earth from climate change, this is a temporary barrier. The Times and its pro-nuke allies in the corporate media will continue to twist reality. But the Solartopian revolution is proceeding ahead of schedule and under budget. A renewable, decentralized energy system is very much in sight. The only question is how long corporate nonsense like this latest NY Times screed can delay this vital transition. Our planet is burning up from fossil fuels and being irradiated by decrepit money-losing reactors that blow up. Blaming renewable energy for all that is like blaming the peace movement for causing wars. The centralized King CONG grid and its obsolete owners are at the core of the problem. So are the corporate media outlets like the New York Times that try to hide that obvious reality.